UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/646,133	08/22/2003	Robert Keane	03-011	8889

37420 7590 03/22/2007

VISTA PRINT USA INC.
ATTN: PATENT COUNSEL
100 HAYDEN AVENUE
LEXINGTON, MA 02421

EXAMINER	
VUU, HENRY	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2179	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/646,133	KEANE, ROBERT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Henry Vuu	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 August 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *22 August 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3 – 6, 8 – 10, 12, 16, and 18 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Berry et al. (Patent No. 6,404,747).

With regard to claim 1, Berry et al. teaches:

A remote assistance system (see e.g., col. 2, lines 1- 17) comprising one or more user systems (see e.g., col. 4, lines 19 - 51; kiosk 10 and agent unit 45), each user system being operatively connected to a network (see e.g., col. 3, lines 24 - 25 and col. 11, lines 26 - 30; i.e., Local Exchange Carrier Wide Area Network (LEC WAN)), wherein an internet link 12 to establish video link between kiosk 10 and agent unit 45) and having a user processor (see e.g., col. 4, lines 19 - 20; i.e., video enabled PC), one or more user tools running on the user processor (see e.g., col. 7, lines 45 - 50; i.e., sharing software application running on kiosk 10 and agent unit 45 for data collaboration), and a user display displaying the results of the user's operation of the one or more user tools to the user of the user system (see e.g., col. 7, lines 45 - 50; i.e., multipoint application data sharing is data collaboration between kiosk 10 and agent unit 45), one or more remote support systems (see e.g., Fig. 2; i.e., agent unit 45), each remote support system being

operatively connected to the network (see e.g., col. 3, lines 24 - 25 and col. 11, lines 26 - 30; i.e., Local Exchange Carrier Wide Area Network (LEC WAN) and having a support processor (see e.g., col. 4, lines 50 - 55; i.e., agent unit 45 may be a video enabled PC), a support display (see e.g., col. 4, lines 50 - 55; i.e., video enabled PC), and one or more programs running on the support processor adapted to allow an operator of the support system to view substantially the same information as is being displayed on at least one user display (see e.g., col. 5, lines 18 - 25), means for establishing a communication connection between a user of a user system and an operator of a remote support system (see e.g., col. 4, lines 19 - 67; i.e., the call traverses a network 15 such as a Public Switch Telephone Network (PSTN) to an organizations PBX 20, wherein the call by kiosk 10 is queued and ultimately routed to an agent using agent unit 45) such that the user of the user system can submit inquiries to (see e.g., col. 4, lines 19 - 22; i.e., select service options on kiosk 10) and receive responses from the operator of the remote support system (see e.g., col. 12, lines 3 - 8; i.e., both parties can view and work on the same web page on the Internet), and means for establishing a communication connection between the user system and the remote support system (see e.g., col. 4, lines 19 - 67) such that the support system can obtain user display information over the network (see e.g., col. 12, lines 3 - 8; i.e., collaborative work on a web page over the Internet) while the operator is communicating with the user over the first communication connection (see e.g., col. 12, lines 15 - 19; i.e., video calls including video and audio).

With regard to claim 3, Berry et al. Teaches:

The system of claim 1 further comprising means for requesting remote support for a user of a user system (see e.g., col. 4, lines 19 - 67 and col. 12, lines 3 - 8; i.e., the user request for remote support by using kiosk 10, wherein the call traverses an network 15 such as a PSTN network to an organization's PBX 20, and allowing collaborative work on a web page), and a server system operatively connected to the network (see e.g., col. 4, lines 28 - 34; i.e., server 30 to service customer calls into a service queue), the server system having means, responsive to the request for remote support (see e.g., col. 4, lines 23 - 34; i.e., server 30 is used to service customer calling into different service queues), for selecting an available one of the one or more remote support systems (see e.g., col. 4, lines 50 - 53; i.e., the call for requesting support from kiosk 10 is ultimately routed to an agent using agent unit 45) to provide remote support to the user (see e.g., col. 3, lines 10 - 16; i.e., Expansion Service Module (ESM) is a server used to enable data collaboration between a user and agent for remote data collaboration) and for supplying the request for support to the selected one of the one or more remote support systems (see e.g., col. 4, lines 43 - 65; i.e., VCM 25 triggers ACD module 35 which routes the request for support based on the availability and skill of an agent).

With regard to claim 4, Berry et al. teaches:

The system of claim 3 wherein the server system further comprises a queue for holding requests for remote support if a support system is not available (see e.g., col. 4, lines 38 - 40 and col. 5, lines 26 - 30; i.e., the user requesting support from kiosk 10 is put in a queue, in which the user is waiting for a connection to an agent).

With regard to claim 5, Berry et al. teaches:

The system of claim I wherein the communication connection between the user of a user system and the operator of a remote support system is an audio connection (see e.g., col. 2, lines 9 - 28; audio component).

With regard to claim 6, Berry et al. teaches:

The system of claim 5 wherein the audio connection is a telephone connection (see e.g., col. 11, lines 22 - 30; i.e., customer calls multimedia call center from a customer access point such as a telephone 11).

With regard to claim 8, Berry et al. teaches:

The system of claim 1 wherein the communication connection between the user of a user system and the operator of a remote support system is a video connection (see e.g., col. 2, lines 8 - 27 and col. 12, lines 3 - 8; i.e., video call).

With regard to claim 9, Berry et al. teaches:

The system of claim 1 wherein the communication connection between the user of a user system and the operator of a remote support system is a text messaging connection (see e.g., col. 1, lines 14 - 18; i.e., e-mail used for servicing customer request for support).

With regard to claim 10, Berry et al. teaches:

A networked (see e.g., col. 3, lines 24 - 25 and col. 4, lines 19 - 26; i.e., Local Exchange Carrier Wide Area Network (LEC WAN) and network 15) user system comprising a processor (see e.g., col.4, lines 19 - 22; i.e., kiosk 10 or video enabled PC), one or more user tools running on the processor (see e.g., col. 7, lines 45 - 50 and

col. 12, lines 3 - 8; i.e., sharing software application running on kiosk 10 and agent unit 45 for data collaboration), a user display displaying the results of the user system user's operation of the one or more user tools (see e.g., col. 7, lines 45 - 50 and col. 12, lines 3 - 8; i.e., multipoint application data sharing is data collaboration between kiosk 10 and agent unit 45), means for providing information to a remote support system to allow the remote support system to display substantially the same results as are being displayed on the user display (see e.g., col. 5, lines 18 - 25 and col. 12, lines 3 - 8; i.e., customer and agent establish an Internet video connection to collaboratively work on a web page) , and means for allowing the user of the user system to submit inquiries to (see e.g., col. 4, lines 19 - 22; i.e., select service options on kiosk 10) and receive responses from the operator of the remote support system (see e.g., col. 12, lines 3 - 8; i.e., both parties can view and work on the same web page on the Internet) while the operator is viewing the display information (see e.g., col. 12, lines 3 - 8; i.e., collaboratively view and work on a web page using an Internet video connection from kiosk 10 and agent unit 45).

With regard to claim 12, Berry et al. teaches:

The system of claims 1 or 10 wherein the one or more user tools include at least one design tool for allowing a user of the user system to edit an electronic document (see e.g., col. 12, lines 3 - 8; i.e., kiosk 10 and agent unit 45 can collaboratively view, work, and edit a web page by a connection through the Internet; wherein the application allowing collaborative work and view corresponds to the design tool).

With regard to claim 14, claim 14 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 10. Thus claim 14 is rejected along the same rationale with respect to claim 10 as previously discussed above.

With regard to claim 16, Berry et al. teaches:

The system of claims 10 or 14 wherein inquiries are submitted and responses are received by audio (see e.g., col. 4, lines 50 - 67 and col. 5, lines 1 - 4; i.e., audio/video conference, wherein the support inquiry is submitted and customer support can be interactive through audio/video).

With regard to claim 18, Berry et al. teaches:

The systems of claims 10 or 14 wherein inquiries are submitted and responses are received by video (see e.g., col. 4, lines 50 - 67 and col. 5, lines 1 - 4; i.e., audio/video conference, wherein the support inquiry is submitted and customer support can be interactive through audio/video).

With regard to claim 19, Berry et al. teaches:

A method of providing assistance (see e.g., col. 12, lines 3 – 8) from an operator of a support system (see e.g., col. 4, lines 50 – 55; i.e., agent unit 45) having a support display (see e.g., col. 4, lines 50 – 55; i.e., video enabled PC) to a user on a remote user system (see e.g., col. 4, lines 19 – 22; i.e., kiosk 10) having a user display (see e.g., col. 4, lines 19 – 22; i.e., video enabled PC), the method comprising receiving a request for remote assistance from the user system (see e.g., col. 4, lines 19 – 49; i.e., selecting service option on kiosk 10), and in response to the request, establishing a communication connection between the user of the user system and the operator of the

support system (see e.g., col. 4, lines 19 – 55; i.e., call is ultimately routed to agent unit 45 through network 15) establishing a communication connection between the user system and the support system (see e.g., col. 2, lines 9 – 17; i.e., audio/video interaction between agent 45 and kiosk 10), and displaying substantially the same the information on the support display as is being displayed on the user display (see e.g., col. 5, lines 18 - 25 and col. 12, lines 3 - 8; i.e., customer and agent establish an Internet video connection to collaboratively work on a web page) while the user and the operator communicate over the communication connection between the user and the operator connection (see e.g., col. 4, lines 66 – 67 and col. 5, lines 1 – 4; i.e., video/audio conference between kiosk 10 and agent 45).

With regard to claim 20, Berry et al. teaches:

A method of providing assistance (see e.g., col. 12, lines 3 – 8) from an operator of a support system (see e.g., col. 4, lines 50 – 55; i.e., agent unit 45) having a support display (see e.g., col. 4, lines 50 – 55; i.e., video enabled PC) to a user on a remote user system (see e.g., col. 4, lines 19 – 22; i.e., kiosk 10) having a user display (see e.g., col. 4, lines 19 – 22; i.e., video enabled PC), the method comprising establishing one or more alert conditions (see e.g., col. 4, lines 19 – 22; i.e., alert condition corresponds to the customer using kiosk 10 and selecting a service option), monitoring the remote user system for the occurrence of one or more of the alert conditions (see e.g., col. 4, lines 19 – 22; i.e., the customer uses kiosk 10 for requesting a service, wherein kiosk 10 monitors for a service request in order to route the request to an appropriate agent unit 45), in response to detection of one or more of the alert

conditions (see e.g., col. 4, lines 19 – 55), establishing a communication connection between the user of the user system and the operator of the support system (see e.g., col. 4, lines 19 – 55; i.e., call is ultimately routed to agent unit 45 through network 15) establishing a communication connection between the user system and the support system (see e.g., col. 2, lines 9 – 17; i.e., audio/video interaction between agent 45 and kiosk 10), and displaying substantially the same the information on the support display as is being displayed on the user display (see e.g., col. 5, lines 18 - 25 and col. 12, lines 3 - 8; i.e., customer and agent establish an Internet video connection to collaboratively work on a web page) while the user and the operator communicate over the communication connection between the user and the operator (see e.g., col. 4, lines 66 – 67 and col. 5, lines 1 – 4; i.e., video/audio conference between kiosk 10 and agent 45).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 11, 15, 21 – 24, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berry et al. (Patent No.6404747) in view of Mohammed et al. (Patent No. 6,973,482).

With regard to claim 2, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 1 as previously discussed above. Berry et al. teaches one or more programs running on the support processor allow the operator of the support system to control the user system (see e.g., col. 12, lines 3 - 8; i.e., collaborative work of a web page over an Internet connection), but does not specifically mention that the operator can cause the results displayed on the user display to be modified. Mohammad et al. teaches the operator can cause the results displayed on the user display to be modified (see e.g., col. 3, lines 25 - 33). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the one or more programs running on the support processor allow the operator of the support system to control the user system of Berry et al. with the operator can cause the results displayed on the user display to be modified of Mohammad et al. because by allowing the expert to modify and control a user's computer, it allows the problem to be resolved more quickly and the user can be educated about their computer by being able to view how the expert solves the problem (see e.g., col. 4, lines 39 - 47).

With regard to claim 11, claim 11 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 2. Thus, claim 11 is rejected along the same rationale with respect to claim 2 as previously discussed above.

With regard to claim 15, claim 15 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 11. Thus, claim 15 is rejected along the same rationale with respect to claim 11 as previously discussed above.

With regard to claim 21, Berry et al. teaches a method of providing assistance (see e.g., col. 12, lines 3 – 8) from an operator of a support system (see e.g., col. 4, lines 50 – 55; i.e., agent unit 45) having a support display (see e.g., col. 4, lines 50 – 55; i.e., video enabled PC) to a user on a remote user system (see e.g., col. 4, lines 19 – 22; i.e., kiosk 10) having a user display (see e.g., col. 4, lines 19 – 22; i.e., video enabled PC), the method comprising establishing one or more alert conditions (see e.g., col. 4, lines 19 – 22; i.e., alert condition corresponds to the customer using kiosk 10 and selecting a service option), monitoring the remote user system for the occurrence of one or more of the alert conditions (see e.g., col. 4, lines 19 – 22; i.e., the customer uses kiosk 10 for requesting a service, wherein kiosk 10 monitors for a service request in order to route the request to an appropriate agent unit 45), in response to detection of one or more of the alert conditions, establishing a communication connection between the user of the user system and the operator of the support system (see e.g., col. 4, lines 19 – 55; i.e., call is ultimately routed to agent unit 45 through network 15), establishing a communication connection between the user system and the support system (see e.g., col. 2, lines 9 – 17; i.e., audio/video interaction between agent 45 and kiosk 10), and displaying substantially the same the information on the support display as is being displayed on the user display (see e.g., col. 5, lines 18 - 25 and col. 12, lines 3 - 8; i.e., customer and agent establish an Internet video connection to collaboratively work on a web page) while the user and the operator communicate over the communication connection between the user and the operator (see e.g., col. 4, lines 66 – 67 and col. 5, lines 1 – 4; i.e., video/audio conference between kiosk 10 and agent

45), but does not specifically mention generating a message to the user of the user system inquiring if the user would like assistance from the support system, if the user indicates that the user would like assistance, establishing a communication connection between the user of the user system and the operator of the support system. Mohammed et al. teaches generating a message to the user of the user system inquiring if the user would like assistance from the support system (see e.g., col. 11, lines 20 – 26; i.e., prompting a user's computer for decision on whether the user would desire remote assistance), if the user indicates that the user would like assistance (see e.g., col.11, lines 63 – 67; i.e., if the user agrees to the remote assistance prompt, an email 504 is sent to the expert for confirmation of acceptance of remote assistance), establishing a communication connection between the user of the user system and the operator of the support system (see e.g., col. 11, lines 63 – 67; i.e., when the email 504 is opened by the expert, a connection is established between the user and the expert). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of providing assistance from an operator of a support system having a support display to a user on a remote user system having a user display of Berry et al. with generating a message to the user of the user system inquiring if the user would like assistance from the support system, if the user indicates that the user would like assistance, establishing a communication connection between the user of the user system and the operator of the support system of Mohammed et al. because by allowing the expert to modify and control a user's computer, it allows the problem to be resolved more quickly and the user can be educated about their

computer by being able to view how the expert solves the problem (see e.g., col. 4, lines 39 - 47).

With regard to claim 22, claim 22 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 2. Thus, claim 22 is rejected along the same rationale with respect to claim 2 as previously discussed above.

With regard to claim 23, claim 23 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 5. Thus, claim 23 is rejected along the same rationale with respect to claim 5 as previously discussed above.

With regard to claim 24, claim 24 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 6. Thus, claim 24 is rejected along the same rationale with respect to claim 6 as previously discussed above.

With regard to claim 26, claim 26 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 8. Thus, claim 26 is rejected along the same rationale with respect to claim 8 as previously discussed above.

With regard to claim 27, claim 27 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 9. Thus, claim 27 is rejected along the same rationale with respect to claim 9 as previously discussed above.

Claims 7 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berry et al. (Patent No. 6,404,747) in view of Abdolsalehi et al. (Publication No. 2003/0158957).

With regard to claim 7, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 5 as previously discussed above. Berry et al. does not specifically mention the audio connection is a voice-over-IP connection. Abdolsalehi et al. teaches the audio connection is a voice-over-IP connection (see e.g., para. [0071], lines 6 – 15; i.e., two-way VOIP audio stream). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporate the communication connection between the user of a user system and the operator of a remote support system is an audio connection of Berry et al. with the audio connection is a voice-over-IP connection of Abdolsalehi et al. because in this manner, the representative can initiate audio communication with the customer as well as a high-quality video demonstration of the product, including product operation, features, trouble-shooting, and repairs (see e.g., para. [0071], lines 6 – 15).

With regard to claim 13, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 10 as previously discussed above. Berry et al. teaches one or more user tools (see e.g., col. 7, lines 45 - 50 and col. 12, lines 3 - 8; i.e., multipoint application data sharing is data collaboration between kiosk 10 and agent unit 45) and a processor (see e.g., col.4, lines 19 - 22; i.e., kiosk 10 or video enabled PC), but does not specifically mention the one or more user tools execute in a browser program. Abdolsalehi et al. teaches one or more user tools executing in a browser program (see e.g., [0030]; i.e., browser-based digital video broadcasting with interactive voice communication). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporate the network system comprising a processor and one or more user

tools running on the processor of Berry et al. with the one or more user tools execute in a browser program of Abdolsalehi et al. because in this manner, the representative can initiate audio communication with the customer as well as a high-quality video demonstration of the product, including product operation, features, trouble-shooting, and repairs (see e.g., para. [0071], lines 6 – 15).

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berry et al. (Patent No.6,404,747) in view of Mohammed et al. (Patent No. 6,973,482) and further in view of Abdolsalehi et al. (Publication No. 2003/0158957).

With respect to claim 25, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 21 as previously discussed above. Both Berry et al. and Mohammed et al. does not specifically mention the audio connection is a voice-over-IP connection. Abdolsalehi et al. teaches the audio connection is a voice-over-IP connection (see e.g., para. [0071], lines 6 – 15; i.e., two-way VOIP audio stream). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of providing assistance from an operator of a support system having a support display to a user on a remote user system having a user display of Berry et al. as modified by generating a message to the user of the user system inquiring if the user would like assistance from the support system, if the user indicates that the user would like assistance, establishing a communication connection between the user of the user system and the operator of the support system of Mohammed et al. with the audio connection is a voice-over-IP connection of Abdolsalehi et al. because in this manner,

the representative can initiate audio communication with the customer as well as a high-quality video demonstration of the product, including product operation, features, trouble-shooting, and repairs (see e.g., para. [0071], lines 6 – 15).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Prior art Patent No. 6,973,617 can be applicable and pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Prior art disclosed by Parasu et al. teaches a browser tool used for customer support, wherein the browser is configured for providing customer services through audio, such as voice over internet protocol (VOIP) and streaming video data.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Prior art Publication No. 2004/0049547 can be applicable and pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Prior art disclosed by Matthews et al. teaches a web browser used to interface a student and a teacher through video, audio, and text means.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Prior art Patent No. 6,871,322 can be applicable and pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Prior art disclosed by Gusler et al. teaches providing real-time user support by placing support request in a queue for processing, and ultimately routed to the most appropriate help agent that is most suited to help the requester.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Henry Vuu whose telephone number is (571) 270-1048. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Henry Vuu

Henry

3/15/2007

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER